

REMARKS:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9-20 and 35-46. Claims 9 and 35 are amended herein. No new matter is presented. Claims 1-8, 21-34 and 47-61 remain cancelled.

Thus, claims 9-20 and 35-46 are pending and under consideration. The rejections are traversed below.

*** **

Set forth below are Replies to Requirement for Information requested by the Examiner starting on page 3 of the Office Action. The Examiner refers to the reference ORMX-Based Buysense.com Connects State & Local Govt. Buyers and Sellers Online and requests for specific improvements over the disclosed prior art and elements in the claims that provide the improvements.

Regarding the Examiner's request for specific improvements of the subject matter in the claims over the disclosed prior art, Applicants submit that the improvements include capability to integrate multiple systems using an e-procurement system and independently hosted module(s) enabling posting of e-procurement transactions from a particular system to multiple external ERP systems, as needed.

Regarding the Examiner's request for specific elements in the claimed subject matter that provide those improvements, Applicants point to the claimed features directed to "encoding a first variable set" of a first system into transaction data using "a parameter based mapper directed to a selected target system of a plurality of target systems" and decoding the transaction data into "a second variable set directed to the selected target system, using the mapper" (see, claims 9 and 35). This, for example, enables integration between an e-procurement system and financial systems, including each application or financial system which may have a unique protocol in order to carry out transactions therewith.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Replies to Requirement for Information are complete, and request that the Examiner contact the undersigned if further information is necessary.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph:

On page 2 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9-20 and 35-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph.

In particular, the Examiner indicates that the Specification while being enabling for a shared executable hosted electronic procurement system, does not reasonably provide enablement for other electronic systems.

The Specification discusses integration between multiple (electronic) systems and explicitly states that the integrator can be used with "any e-procurement system regardless of whether it is an unhosted, hosted, or shared executable hosted model" (see, page 15, line 19 through 16, line 7).

Applicants respectfully submit that support for the claimed invention can be found at least on page 12, lines 9-16; page 18, line 20 through page 18, line 7-14; page 26, 11-15, Figures 2, 3, 4 including corresponding texts of the Specification as filed.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph:

On page 2 of the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 9-20 and 35-46 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph. Claims 9 and 35 are amended herein to clarify the claimed invention.

The Examiner also indicated that the features directed to "parameter based mapper" is indefinite. For example, Table II starting on page 22 of the Specification indicates that a mapper file written in XML may be created for a particular target Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system to define a first set of variables with respective values into a second set of corresponding variables, so that the values can be passed to the second set of variables.

Independent claim 9, by way of example, recites "encoding a first variable set directed to a first system into transaction data using a parameter based mapper directed to a selected target system of a plurality of target systems" and "decoding the transaction data into a second variable set directed to the selected target system, using the mapper." Independent claim 35 recites similar features.

Therefore, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION:

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 11/26/2007

By: 
Temnit Afework
Registration No. 58,202

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501